

CACC MEETING MINUTES

COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Thursday, August 18, 2011
10:00 AM - 11:30 AM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007



AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: 1-602-425-3192
AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 1112#

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kip Anderson*
Cathy Clarich*
Julie Dybas
Mary Hawkins*
Donald Jacobson
Phillip Knox*
Richard McHattie
Michael Malone
Rona Newton
Patricia Noland*
Michael Pollard, *Chair*
Rick Rager
Paul Thomas

GUESTS

David Adams*, *Pima Superior Court*
Jennifer Gilbertson, *Phoenix Municipal Court*
Lester Godsey, *City of Mesa*
Cindy McDonald, *MCJC*
Carol Merfeld*, *Pima Superior Court*
Don Taylor, *Phoenix Municipal Court*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Patrick McGrath

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Adele May, *ITD*
Alicia Moffatt, *ITD*
Jim Price, *ITD*
Theresa Barrett, *CSD*
Renny Rapier, *ITD*

* indicates appeared by telephone

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Judge Michael Pollard, Chair, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order just after 10:00 a.m. Staff confirmed that a quorum existed. The chair expressed his concern about the apparent lack of communication among project managers as well as between project managers and CACC lately. He proposed calling managers of all projects appearing on the MindMap to the September meeting with a goal of resetting expectations about the degree of communication that ought to be occurring between managers of projects and managers of dependant projects. Members recommended that some sort of framework be established for documenting those expectation; the chair and staff will produce a modified framework for the next meeting. Judge Pollard then requested members' input regarding the minutes from the July CACC meeting.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the revised minutes of the July 21, 2011, CACC meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

PACC UPDATE

There was no PACC meeting on which to report in the past month. (Updates are now only provided following PACC meetings.)

REVIEW OF CHANGES TO MINDMAP THIS MONTH

Staff member Stewart Bruner briefly reported on some structural changes he made to include vendors whose product releases are depended upon by various projects. He also removed tasks that had been complete for more than 60 days and redid the macro project timeline handout to reflect COT's priority list from the annual meeting.

He detailed various changes made by managers of both statewide and local projects since last meeting. The bulk of individual project managers will cover the details in their presentations later in the agenda. Phil Knox responded to a request for more detail about Administrative Order 2011-87, enforcing mandatory e-filing at Maricopa Superior Court.

GJ AJACS PROJECT UPDATE

Renny Rapiet, manager for the general jurisdiction (GJ) case management system (CMS) enhancements project, explained to members that the interfaces necessary to support ADRS, JOLTSaz, and APETS have been placed into later releases of AJACS than originally estimated – Release 3.8 in February 2012 and 3.9 in July 2012. The slips have no direct affect on the JOLTSaz/AGAVE implementation scheduled for February. Renny described the work that was already completed in support of the Pima effort. Rona Newton warned against scheduling APETS and JOLTS interfaces to deploy simultaneously because of the impact on probation operations.

MESA LV ENHANCEMENTS PROJECT UPDATE

Paul Thomas, Court Administrator for Mesa, listed the project managers and business analysts currently working on the Large Volume (LV) Enhancements Project. Michael Tonsing, the court's project manager, will begin work on September 6. Lester Godsey from Mesa IT, the interim project manager, reviewed the key milestones in the business requirements portion of the project plan. Paul requested an additional iteration of the schedule before MindMap reporting

begins. Les also explained that a recurring meeting is being set with AOC CMS project representatives to ensure continued close communication throughout the development effort. In response to a question, Les and Adele May listed nightly compliance processing and bench automation as the functions representing the widest divide between Mesa's expectations and AJACS' current functionality. Members were encouraged to hear that various lessons learned from other courts and the AOC were being acted on already.

LJ AJACS CMS UPDATE

Adele May, Limited Jurisdiction (LJ) CMS Project Manager at the AOC, listed some tasks related to business requirement determination that had resided in her project plan but are being included in the Mesa effort now. Additional AOC resources are also being supplied to the Mesa effort in exchange for the specific AZTEC replacement tasks being given the highest priority in order to make the cutoff date for the AJACS 3.9 release. Adele clarified that the foundation of the functionality will be received for testing before the user interface is made available.

E-FILING AND RELATED PROJECTS UPDATE

Jim Price, AZTurboCourt Project Manager at the AOC, updated members on enhancements in the TurboCourt product's August 12 release. Rich McHattie explained the advantage provided to the clerk on the refund front by clarifying certain questions asked of filers in the intelligent forms application.

Jim continued to praise the efforts of Pima Superior Court personnel and attributed the recent delay to implementation faced by the court to both Intresys and the AOC. His hope for Pima is an early October soft launch with a couple of law firms once the necessary software changes are made. The items at issue are critical to the case initiation process and therefore affect the specification for statewide GJ e-filing, causing that dependent project to slip, as well.

Jim also described reasons for his removal of the implementation date for Maricopa Justice Courts (MCJC) small claims e-filing from the MindMap. The chair expressed concern regarding the multiple vendor dependencies involved in the MCJC project: CTS/iCIS, Intresys/TurboCourt, and OSAM/OnBase. Cindy McDonald, the MCJC project manager, related the high turnover and competition for staff resources being experienced. She stated that the various outside resources, including Myron Pecora, are meeting together with the court daily to speed the project along. She is confident in the October implementation date, provided MCJC's "showstopper" defects like person matching get addressed in time. Stewart elaborated on Cindy's point about the complex web of projects being undertaken at MCJC to enable the pinnacle application of e-filing. Members discussed what could be done to help but arrived at no specific course of action. Judge Pollard summarized that the level of detail Cindy provided is what CACC desires to hear on a regular basis.

In the monthly criminal e-filing update, Jim stated that a push is on to get ACJC involved in mapping the workflow for AFIS input and updates. He walked through his understanding of the manual process and limited jurisdiction court representatives corrected him about various steps. Judge Pollard asked whether COT needs to be informed about the differences between criminal case processing in LJ courts and criminal case processing in GJ courts.

Rick Rager asked members whether they thought it might be appropriate for vendor representatives to address CACC about release dependencies various projects have on them.

POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS

Stewart brought members up to date with the recent implementations of OnBase 9.2 at Graham Superior Court and Coconino Superior Court. He characterized the resulting issues in Graham as being related to the locations of the local OnBase servers that were hardcoded into the AJACS script and in Coconino as a total lack of communication with the AOC about security synchronization, Unity, and AJACS script changes. Though Coconino's issues will take time to resolve, a conference call next Monday starts the process. Stewart mentioned his dissatisfaction with the EDMS vendor for not reporting the conversion date to AOC until after the fact.

ITEMS OF OLD OR NEW BUSINESS

Paul Thomas announced that, as of July 11, 2011, the Mesa City Court is a totally paperless operation. Members applauded Mesa's efforts and inquired about judges' adoption of electronic documents on the bench and in chambers. Paul described the change as being manageable, thus far.

The next meeting will take place in **Room 230** of the **State Courts Building** on **September 15, 2011**.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.